

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated May 3, 2004.

The Examiner has objected to claims 2-4 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-4 have been canceled and replaced with new claim 5 in order to overcome the objection and rejection.

Moreover, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Byrnes et al. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Thiry. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Lamprey. However, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn in light of the following reasons.

Byrnes et al, the first reference cited by the Examiner, discloses a tubular elastomer damper having uniform strain from an inner to an outer surface of the elastomer, to minimize loss of damping properties. However, this reference fails to disclose a multifunctional shock-resisting structure comprising: an external frame being an open or closed socket body of different shapes; an actuating rod having an end inserted into said external frame; a braking layer being positioned between said external frame and said actuating rod, wherein after said actuating rod is inserted into said external frame, said braking layer is filled into a space between said actuating rod and said external frame such that an inner edge of said external frame and said actuating rod is interconnected by said braking layer; and material for said external

frame, the braking layer and the actuating rod being different hardness. Hence, this reference can be clearly distinguished from the present invention.

Thiry, the second reference cited by the Examiner, discloses flexible joints in which relatively movable members are interconnected by a layer of rubber like material. Nevertheless, this reference does not teach or suggest a multifunctional shock-resisting structure comprising: an external frame being an open or closed socket body of different shapes; an actuating rod having an end inserted into said external frame; a braking layer being positioned between said external frame and said actuating rod, wherein after said actuating rod is inserted into said external frame, said braking layer is filled into a space between said actuating rod and said external frame such that an inner edge of said external frame and said actuating rod is interconnected by said braking layer; and material for said external frame, the braking layer and the actuating rod being different hardness. Thus, the Dudley reference is irrelevant to the present invention.

Lamprey, the third reference cited by the Examiner, discloses a torsional energy absorption device which may be used in the suspension system of various vehicles and industrial equipment is provided by filling the entire space between a hollow outer member and an inner shaft member with an elastomeric material such as polyurethane. Similarly, this reference fails to teach or suggest a multifunctional shock-resisting structure comprising: an external frame being an open or closed socket body of different shapes; an actuating rod having an end inserted into said external frame; a braking layer being positioned between said external frame and said actuating rod, wherein after said actuating rod is inserted into said external frame, said braking layer is filled into a space between said actuating rod and said external frame such that an inner edge of said external frame and said actuating rod is interconnected by said braking layer; and material for said external frame, the

braking layer and the actuating rod being different hardness. Consequently, this reference is in no way similar to the present invention.

Accordingly, even if the disclosures of the cited references are combined together, the combined disclosure still fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention and so the subject matter sought to be patented as a whole would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the new claim clearly and distinctly patentably defines over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

August 2, 2004